



May 23, 2007

SUBJECT: THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

The Land Development Ordinance Committee (LDOC) met Wednesday, May 23, 2007, at 4 p.m., in the second floor Seminar Room located at The Plaza, 100 W. Innes Street, to discuss rewriting Salisbury's ordinance code. In attendance were Jake Alexander, Bill Burgin (Co-chair), George Busby, Mark Lewis (Co-chair), Brian Miller, Rodney Queen, Jeff Smith, Bill Wagoner and Victor Wallace.

Absent: Karen Alexander, John Casey, Phil Conrad, and Steve Fisher

Staff Present: Patrick Kennerly, Dan Mikkelson, Preston Mitchell, Diana Moghrabi, Joe Morris, David Phillips, Lynn Raker, and Patrick Ritchie

The meeting was called to order with Bill Burgin (Co-chair) presiding. The minutes of the May 16, 2007, meeting were accepted.

Chapter Summaries

- Chapter 5, revision 5/20/07 – reflects George Busby's and other committee members' comments. All comments were reviewed, although, not all comments resulted in revisions.
- Chapter 4, 4.8 Outdoor Storage added
- Chapter 5, Page 5-2, Section 5.4.A.4 Campus Style Development
Discussion:
 - Bottom–add bullets “May include list”
 - Further define campus style
 - Examples cited with common unified design and internal sidewalk system.
 - No “by right” campus style development; it must be a CD.
 - Re-word the last sentence of 5.4.A.1.
 - Who will define what is acceptable (CD)? TRC comments, Planning Board, City Council
 - A CD must still hold to the comprehensive plan.
 - This could be an opportunity to go outside the existing code.
 - The tree issue needs to be examined further
 - Bill Wagoner objects to the staff having so much time in a presentation and the proponent (developer) only getting three minutes to make a presentation. This needs to change. If a CD is a negotiated process, we need a methodology for the developer to have equal time.
 - Compare to the comprehensive plan and not to a code

- Charlotte begins the process in a committee; staff to research this.
- Developer has access to staff prior to meetings when submitting plans and requesting rezonings.
- There is a preference to have apartments on public streets. A discussion followed around the room.
- Page 5-8, Building Type–House
 - When density is intensified the buildings have to behave better
 - The table is missing a row; add:
 - 40-54 feet wide/required /required/not required/alley/attached or detached/not required
 - Row 3 on table will be 55 plus/required/required/not required/alley or street/attached or detached/not required (eliminate other verbiage)
- Review page 5-9
 - Infill standards
 - Open up “by right” what’s currently done in RDA, RDB
 - CD required for ‘snout house.’
- Page 5-12 Townhouse
 - 20-39 feet wide requires most design elements
 - Front loaded garages have percentage requirements
 - As lot gets smaller, garage goes down to single
 - Garage bay door 18’ wording needs work/cannot exceed 40% of façade/Maximum width page 5-13, 3.b.iv. maximum width (change)
 - There was a great deal of discussion on differences between condominiums, townhomes, and apartments. Victor thought this to be too confusing to a layperson. Jake has concerns with the 2’ elevation. George Busby recommends that they are two-story.
 - Page 5-20, Section 5.7, Mixed–Use & Commercial Building Types, A.1.c, Flat roof use current code
- Mark Lewis requested a “by right” expedient checklist.
- The committee wants to do more research on “senior” projects
- Go back and clarify terms townhouse and apartments
- Next submittal information will be Chapter 16
- George Busby suggested that townhouses are two-story.